STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
INTER-DEPARTMENT COMMUNICATION

DATE: January 21, 2016

FROM: Matt Urban
Wetlands Program Manager

AT (OFFICE): Department of Transportation
Bureau of Environment

SUBJECT Dredge & Fill Application
Gilford, 40776

TO Gino Infascelli, Public Works Permitting Officer
New Hampshire Wetlands Bureau
29 Hazen Drive, P.O. Box 95
Concord, NH 03302-0095

Forwarded herewith is the application package prepared by NH DOT Bureau of Bridge Maintenance for the subject Major impact project. This project is classified as major per Env-Wt 303.02(p). The project is located on NH Route 11B over Meadow Brook in the Town of Gilford. The existing structure is a concrete frame bridge with a 12' span and is 31'-8" wide. The existing concrete deck slab is in poor condition with cracks, spalls and delamination. The deck slab will be replaced in kind and riprap will be installed at the south east bank.

The lead people to contact for this project are Steve Johnson, Assistant Administrator, Bureau of Bridge Maintenance (271-3668 or sjohnson@dot.state.nh.us) or Matt Urban, Wetlands Program Manager, Bureau of Environment (271-3226 or murban@dot.state.nh.us).

A payment voucher has been processed for this application (Voucher #422631) in the amount of $200.

If and when this application meets with the approval of the Bureau, please send the permit directly to Matt Urban, Wetlands Program Manager, Bureau of Environment.

MRU:mru
Enclosures

cc:
BOE Original
Town of Gilford, (4 copies via certified mail)
Darrel Elliott, Environment
Carol Henderson, NH Fish & Game
Edna Feighner, NH Division of Historic Resources (NHDOT Cultural Review within)
Maria Tur, US Fish & Wildlife
Mark Kern, US Environmental Protection Agency
Michael Hicks , US Army Corp of Engineers

S:\Environment\PROJECTS\GILFORD\40776\WETAPP - Bridge Maintenance.doc

THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES
LAND RESOURCES MANAGEMENT
WETLANDS BUREAU
29 Hazen Drive, PO Box 95, Concord, NH 03302-0095
Phone: (603) 271-2147 Fax: (603) 271-6588
http://des.nh.gov/organization/divisions/water/wetlands

PERMIT APPLICATION

Administrative Use Only	Administrative Use Only	Administrative Use Only	Check No.
			Amount
			Initials

1. REVIEW TIME:
Indicate your Review Time below. Refer to Guidance Document A for instructions.

☒ Standard Review (Minimum, Minor or Major Impact) ☐ Expedited Review (Minimum Impact)

2. PROJECT LOCATION:
Separate applications must be filed with each municipality that jurisdictional impacts will occur in.

ADDRESS: **NH Rte. 11B over Meadow Brook** TOWN/CITY: **Gilford**

TAX MAP:	BLOCK:	LOT:	UNIT:

USGS TOPO MAP WATERBODY NAME: **Meadow Brook** ☐ NA STREAM WATERSHED SIZE: **2.10 mi2** ☐ NA

LOCATION COORDINATES (If known): **043`34'48.70" 071`24'31.69"** ☒ Latitude/Longitude
☐ UTM ☐ State Plane

3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION:
Provide a brief description of the project outlining the scope of work. Attach additional sheets as needed to provide a detailed explanation of your project. DO NOT reply "See Attached" in the space provided below.

The existing structure is a concrete frame bridge with a 12' span and is 31'-8" wide. The existing concrete deck slab is in poor condition with cracks, spalls and delamination. The deck slab will be replaced in kind and riprap will be installed on the banks.

4. RELATED PERMITS, ENFORCEMENT, EMERGENCY AUTHORIZATION, SHORELAND, ALTERATION OF TERRAIN, ETC...

5. NATURAL HERITAGE BUREAU & DESIGNATED RIVERS:
See the Instructions & Required Attachments document for instructions to complete a & b below.

a. Natural Heritage Bureau File ID: NHB **15** - **3556**

b. ☐ Designated River the project is in ¼ miles of: _____ ; and
date a copy of the application was sent to Local River Advisory Committee: Month: __ Day: __ Year: ____
☒ NA

6. APPLICANT INFORMATION (Desired permit holder)

LAST NAME, FIRST NAME, M.I.: **Johnson, Steve W**

TRUST / COMPANY NAME: **NH Dept. of Transportation** | MAILING ADDRESS: **7 Hazen Drive**

TOWN/CITY: **Concord** | STATE: **NH** | ZIP CODE: **03302**

EMAIL or FAX: **sjohnson@dot.state.nh.us** | PHONE: **603 271 3667**

ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATION: By initialing here: _____, I hereby authorize DES to communicate all matters relative to this application electronically

7. PROPERTY OWNER INFORMATION (If different than applicant)

LAST NAME, FIRST NAME, M.I.:

TRUST / COMPANY NAME: | MAILING ADDRESS:

TOWN/CITY: | STATE: | ZIP CODE:

EMAIL or FAX: | PHONE:

ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATION: By initialing here SJW, I hereby authorize DES to communicate all matters relative to this application electronically

8. AUTHORIZED AGENT INFORMATION

LAST NAME, FIRST NAME, M.I.: **Weatherbee, Anthony N** | COMPANY NAME: **NH Dept. of Transportation**

MAILING ADDRESS: **7 Hazen Drive**

TOWN/CITY: **Concord** | STATE: **NH** | ZIP CODE: **03302**

EMAIL or FAX: **aweatherbee@dot.state.nh.us** | PHONE: **603-271-3667**

ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATION: By initialing here ANW, I hereby authorize DES to communicate all matters relative to this application electronically

9. PROPERTY OWNER SIGNATURE:

See the Instructions & Required Attachments document for clarification of the below statements

By signing the application, I am certifying that:

1. I authorize the applicant and/or agent indicated on this form to act in my behalf in the processing of this application, and to furnish upon request, supplemental information in support of this permit application.
2. I have reviewed and submitted information & attachments outlined in the Instructions and Required Attachment document.
3. All abutters have been identified in accordance with RSA 482-A:3, I and Env-Wt 100-900.
4. I have read and provided the required information outlined in Env-Wt 302.04 for the applicable project type.
5. I have read and understand Env-Wt 302.03 and have chosen the least impacting alternative.
6. Any structure that I am proposing to repair/replace was either previously permitted by the Wetlands Bureau or would be considered grandfathered per Env-Wt 101.47.
7. I have submitted a copy of the application materials to the NH State Historic Preservation Officer.
8. I authorize DES and the municipal conservation commission to inspect the site of the proposed project.
9. I have reviewed the information being submitted and that to the best of my knowledge the information is true and accurate.
10. I understand that the willful submission of falsified or misrepresented information to the New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services is a criminal act, which may result in legal action.
11. I am aware that the work I am proposing may require additional state, local or federal permits which I am responsible for obtaining.
12. The mailing addresses I have provided are up to date and appropriate for receipt of DES correspondence. DES will not forward returned mail.

Steve W Johnson	STEVE W JOHNSON	11/30/15
⇨ Property Owner Signature	Print name legibly	Date

MUNICIPAL SIGNATURES

10. CONSERVATION COMMISSION SIGNATURE

The signature below certifies that the municipal conservation commission has reviewed this application, and:

1. Waives its right to intervene per RSA 482-A:11;
2. Believes that the application and submitted plans accurately represent the proposed project; and
3. Has no objection to permitting the proposed work.

⇨ Authorized Commission Signature	Print name legibly	Date

DIRECTIONS FOR CONSERVATION COMMISSION

1. Expedited review ONLY requires that the conservation commission's signature is obtained in the space above.
2. The Conservation Commission signature should be obtained prior to the submittal of the original application and four copies to the town/city clerk for mailing to the DES.
3. The Conservation Commission may refuse to sign. If the Conservation Commission does not sign this statement for any reason, the application is not eligible for expedited review and the application will reviewed in the standard review time frame.

11. TOWN / CITY CLERK SIGNATURE

As required by Chapter 482-A:3 (amended 1991), I hereby certify that the applicant has filed five application forms, five detailed plans, and five USGS location maps with the town/city indicated below and I have received and retained certified postal receipts (or copies) for all abutters identified by the applicant.

⇨ Town/City Clerk Signature	Print name legibly	Town/City	Date

DIRECTIONS FOR TOWN/CITY CLERK:

Per RSA 482-A:3,I(d):

1. For applications where "Expedited Review" is checked on page 1, accept the application for mailing only if the Conservation Commission signature has been sought;
2. Collect the postal receipts demonstrating that all abutters and the Local Advisory Committee were sent proper notice;
3. Collect any administrative fees, not to exceed $10 plus the cost of postage by certified mail (RSA 482-A:3,I).
4. IMMEDIATELY sign the original application and four copies in the signature space provided above;
5. Retain one copy of the application form, one complete set of attachments and the postal receipts demonstrating that all abutters and the Local River Advisory Committee were notified and make them reasonably accessible to the public;
6. IMMEDIATELY distribute a copy of the application with one complete set of attachments to each of the following bodies: the municipal Conservation Commission, the local governing body (Board of Selectmen or Town/City Council), and the Planning Board in accordance with RSA 482-A:3, I; and
7. IMMEDIATELY send the ORIGINAL application form, one complete set of attachments and filing fee, by CERTIFIED MAIL to the NHDES Wetlands Bureau at the address indicated on page 1 of this application. (DO NOT HOLD FOR CONSERVATION COMMISSION SIGNATURE).

12. IMPACT AREA:

For each jurisdictional area that will be/has been impacted, provide square feet and, if applicable, linear feet of impact

Permanent: impacts that will remain after the project is complete.

Temporary: impacts not intended to remain (and will be restored to pre-construction conditions) after the project is complete.

After-the-fact (ATF): work completed prior to receipt of this application by DES. Check box to indicate ATF.

JURISDICTIONAL AREA	PERMANENT Sq. Ft. / Lin. Ft.		TEMPORARY Sq. Ft. / Lin. Ft.	
Forested wetland		☐ ATF		☐ ATF
Scrub-shrub wetland		☐ ATF		☐ ATF
Emergent wetland		☐ ATF		☐ ATF
Wet meadow		☐ ATF		☐ ATF
Intermittent stream		☐ ATF		☐ ATF
Perennial Stream / River	/	☐ ATF	642 / 52	☐ ATF
Lake / Pond	/	☐ ATF	91 / 5	☐ ATF
Bank - Intermittent stream	/	☐ ATF	/	☐ ATF
Bank - Perennial stream / River	11 / 5	☐ ATF	50 / 18	☐ ATF
Bank - Lake / Pond	/	☐ ATF	/	☐ ATF
Tidal water	/	☐ ATF	/	☐ ATF
Salt marsh		☐ ATF		☐ ATF
Sand dune		☐ ATF		☐ ATF
Prime wetland		☐ ATF		☐ ATF
Prime wetland buffer		☐ ATF		☐ ATF
Undeveloped Tidal Buffer Zone (TBZ)		☐ ATF		☐ ATF
Previously-developed upland in TBZ		☐ ATF		☐ ATF
Docking - Lake / Pond		☐ ATF		☐ ATF
Docking - River		☐ ATF		☐ ATF
Docking - Tidal Water		☐ ATF		☐ ATF
TOTAL	11 / 5		783 / 75	

13. APPLICATION FEE: See the Instructions & Required Attachments document for further instruction

☒ Minimum Impact Fee: Flat fee of $ 200

☐ Minor or Major Impact Fee: Calculate using the below table below

Permanent and Temporary (non-docking)	**794** sq. ft.	X	$0.20 =	$ **158.80**
Temporary (seasonal) docking structure:	sq. ft.	X	$1.00 =	$
Permanent docking structure:	sq. ft.	X	$2.00 =	$
Projects proposing shoreline structures (including docks) add $200 =				$
			Total =	$
The Application Fee is the above calculated Total or $200, whichever is greater =				$ **200.00**

RIPRAP GRADATION
D15 < 10"
D50 < 12"
D100 < 24"



WETLAND IMPACTS
SCALE: 1" = 20'-0"

10 0 10 20
SCALE IN FEET

WETLAND IMPACT SUMMARY					
WETLAND NUMBER	WETLAND CLASSIFICATION	LOCATION	AREA		
			PERMANENT IMPACTS		TEMPORARY IMPACTS
			N.H.W.B. (NON-WETLAND) SF	N.H.W.B. & A.C.O.E. (WETLAND) SF	SF
1	R2UB2	A			642
2	L2UB2	B			91
3	BANK	C			32
3	BANK	D	11		18
		E			
		F			
		G			
		H			
		I			

PERMANENT IMPACTS: 11 SF
TEMPORARY IMPACTS: 783 SF

TOTAL IMPACTS: 794 SF

WETLAND CLASSIFICATION CODES	
R2UB2	RIVERINE, LOWER PERENNIAL, UNCONSOLIDATED BOTTOM, SAND
L2UB2	LACUSTRINE, LITTORAL, UNCONSOLIDATED BOTTOM, SAND
BANK	

LEGEND

TYPE OF WETLAND IMPACT	SHADING/ HATCHING
NEW HAMPSHIRE WETLANDS BUREAU (PERMANENT NON-WETLAND)	
NEW HAMPSHIRE WETLANDS BUREAU & ARMY CORP OF ENGINEERS (PERMANENT WETLAND)	
TEMPORARY IMPACTS	

(#) WETLAND DESIGNATION NUMBER

WETLAND IMPACT LOCATION

(#) WETLAND MITIGATION AREA

MITIGATION



COFFERDAM DETAILS

NOT TO SCALE

WETLANDS DELINEATED BY MATT URBAN ON 10/2015

THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
STEVE W. JOHNSON
No. 7365
LICENSED PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER
Steve W. Johnson 11/30/15

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION * BUREAU OF BRIDGE MAINTENANCE

TOWN GILFORD BRIDGE NO. 097/094 STATE PROJECT 40776
LOCATION RTE. 11B OVER MEADOW BROOK

WETLAND IMPACTS

BRIDGE SHEET 1 OF 1

REVISIONS AFTER PROPOSAL	BY	DATE		BY	DATE
DESIGNED	ANW	11/17/15	CHECKED	SWJ	11/30/15
DRAWN	ANW	11/17/15	CHECKED	SWJ	11/30/15
QUANTITIES			CHECKED		

FILE NUMBER GILFORD 097/094

ISSUE DATE	FISCAL YEAR	CREW	SHEET NO	TOTAL SHEETS
REV. DATE	2016	03	1	1

SHEET SCALE
AS NOTED

CONSTRUCTION SEQUENCE

1. Temporary scaffolding will be placed in the brook.
2. The concrete deck will be replaced.
3. Silt booms will be placed.
4. Riprap will be repaired.
5. Temporary scaffolding and cofferdams will be removed and the site will be restored to its original quality.

Note:

Project will use and maintain DES Best Management Practices at all stages of construction.



New Hampshire Department of Transportation
Bureau of Bridge Maintenance

Project # 40776, Bridge # 097/094
Gilford, NH, Rte. 11B over Meadow Brook

THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES
LAND RESOURCES MANAGEMENT
WETLANDS BUREAU
29 Hazen Drive, PO Box 95, Concord, NH 03302-0095
Phone: (603) 271-2147 Fax: (603) 271-6588
http://des.nh.gov/organization/divisions/water/wetlands/index.htm
Permit Application Status: http://des.nh.gov/onestop/index.htm

PERMIT APPLICATION – ATTACHMENT A
MINOR & MAJOR 20 QUESTIONS

Env-Wt 302.04 Requirements for Application Evaluation – For any major or minor project, the applicant shall demonstrate by plan and example that the following factors have been considered in the project's design in assessing the impact of the proposed project to areas and environments under the department's jurisdiction. Respond with statements demonstrating:

1. The need for the proposed impact.

This structure has a concrete deck that is in poor condition. The existing concrete deck slab has cracks, spalls and delamination. It is necessary to impact jurisdictional areas to provide for the repairs. The impacts are for temporary scaffolding, the riprap, and for temporary construction access. If the structure is not rehabilitated, it will eventually be load posted or closed.

2. That the alternative proposed by the applicant is the one with the least impact to the wetlands or surface waters on site.

The alternatives considered are as follows:

Replace structure with a new structure in compliance with the NH Stream Crossing Guidelines: According to the NH Stream Crossing Guidelines, if a new structure were to be constructed at this location it would require a span of 24'-0". A structure of this size would cost approximately $750,000. Spending this much money on a structure that could be adequately preserved for approximately $100,000 would not be a practicable use of resources. There would also be significant wetland impacts if a structure of this size were installed due to the additional footprint and for construction.

Replace concrete deck and place riprap: This is the chosen alternative. Impacts for replacing the deck and repairing the substructure are limited to temporary impacts to provide for scaffolding and construction access. The impacts for the deck replacement and riprap are less than they would be for the larger structure alternative. This is the most cost-effective and lowest impact solution to prolong the life of the structure.

In the November 18, 2015 Natural Resource Agency Coordination Meeting it was requested by NH Fish and Game that any equipment used in the water, including scaffolding, be washed off prior to leaving the job site in order to prevent the spread of Milfoil. All equipment will be washed in accordance with this request and any additional conditions listed in the permint.

3. The type and classification of the wetlands involved.

R2UB2: Riverine, lower perennial, unconsolidated bottom, sand

L2UB2: Lacustrine, littoral, unconsolidated bottom, sand

Bank

4. The relationship of the proposed wetlands to be impacted relative to nearby wetlands and surface waters.

Meadow Brook flows into Lake Winnipesaukee

5. The rarity of the wetland, surface water, sand dunes, or tidal buffer zone area.

Meadow Brook has not been identified as a rare surface water of the state.

6. The surface area of the wetlands that will be impacted.

642ft^2 Riverine (642ft^2 temporary, 0ft^2 permanent)
91ft^2 Lacustrine (91ft^2 temporary, 0ft^2 permanent
61ft^2 Bank (50ft^2 temporary, 11ft^2 permanent)

7. The impact on plants, fish, and wildlife, but not limited to:
   a. Rare, special concern species;
   b. State and federally listed threatened and endangered species;
   c. Species at the extremities of their ranges;
   d. Migratory fish and wildlife;
   e. Exemplary natural communities identified by the DRED-NHB; and
   f. Vernal pools.

No rare or special concern species were identified within the proposed project area.

There were no State or Federally listed threatened or endangered species identified within the project limits.

As for the Northern Long-eared Bat (NLEB), tree clearing is not required as a result of the proposed work. Furthermore, the Bureau of Bridge Maintenance will be completing a Bridge Inspection Form no more than 7 days prior to commencing construction. If no signs of bat utilization are observed, and no clearing is proposed, the project will have No Effect on NLEB. If any signs of bat utilization are observed, work will not commence until coordination with USFWS and NHDOT Bureau of Environment has been completed.

There are no species known to be at the extremities of their ranges located in the project area.

Migratory fish and wildlife will be protected under the direction of NH Fish and Game.

The Department has coordinated with DRED and the results of the NHB review revealed no records in this area.

There were no vernal pools identified and/or delineated in the project area.

8. The impact of the proposed project on public commerce, navigation and recreation.

During construction, access to the nearby residents and/or commercial businesses will be maintained at all times. Access will be maintained by alternating traffic with a one lane closure. Meadow Brook is non-navigable water which makes it non-conducive to boaters. There is a marina and a pedestrian bridge located downstream of the structure and this project will not interfere. During construction fishing activities from the banks of the brook will need to occur outside of the construction work zone. When construction is completed, the project as proposed will be a benefit to the public commerce.

9. The extent to which a project interferes with the aesthetic interests of the general public. For example, where an applicant proposes the construction of a retaining wall on the bank of a lake, the applicant shall be required to indicate the type of material to be used and the effect of the construction of the wall on the view of other users of the lake.

The project will not significantly interfere with the aesthetic interests of the general public. The proposed improvements will be more pleasing to the eye than the structure in poor condition.

10. The extent to which a project interferes with or obstructs public rights of passage or access. For example, where the applicant proposes to construct a dock in a narrow channel, the applicant shall be required to document the extent to which the dock would block or interfere with the passage through this area.

The project will not interfere with or obstruct public rights of passage or access. During construction at least one lane of alternating traffic will be maintained at all times. This will ensure access to all nearby businesses and residential homes in this area. Upon completion of this project the bridge will be reopened to two way traffic.

11. The impact upon the abutting pursuant to RSA 482-A:11, II. For example, if an applicant is proposing to riprap a stream, the applicant shall be required to document the effect of such work on upstream and downstream abutting properties.
The project is expected to have a positive impact on abutting properties. The rehabilitated structure will better serve the abutting properties if they need to travel on the road. The riprap that is being installed will help prevent a washout of the structure which will better protect abutting properties. **The project as proposed will not alter the chance of flooding on abutting properties.**
12. The benefit of a project to the health, safety, and well-being of the general public.
The project will provide a safer, longer lasting structure and roadway. If the structure is not rehabilitated, the bridge will eventually be load posted or closed. Keeping the roadway open benefits commerce, trade, emergency access, etc, for the general public.
13. The impact of a proposed project on quantity or quality of surface and ground water. For example, where an applicant proposes to fill wetlands the applicant shall be required to document the impact of the proposed fill on the amount of drainage entering the site versus the amount of drainage exiting the site and difference in the quality of water entering and exiting the site.
The surface water currently runs off the bridge at the curb lines, to the wingwalls, and then off the structure. Upon completion of the project surface will drain water in the same manner. This will have no adverse effects on the quality or quantity of surface and ground water. Best Management Practices will be used to prevent any adverse effect to water quality during construction.
14. The potential of a proposed project to cause or increase flooding, erosion, or sedimentation.
Flooding: High and low flows will not be changed as a result of this project. **Erosion: The riprap placed on the banks will prevent erosion and preserve the natural alignment and gradient of the stream channel.** **Sedimentation: Nothing that will be a barrier to sediment transport will be installed in this project.**
15. The extent to which a project that is located in surface waters reflects or redirects current or wave energy which might cause damage or hazards.
Surface waters will not be reflected or redirected as a result of this project. Meadow Brook does not have enough surface water for wave energy to be an issue.
16. The cumulative impact that would result if all parties owning or abutting a portion of the affected wetland or wetland complex were also permitted alternations to the wetland proportional to the extent of their property rights. For example, an applicant who owns only a portion of a wetland shall document the applicant's percentage ownership of that wetland and the percentage of that ownership that would be impacted.
The work consists of a repair of an existing bridge structure. There are no similar structures in the vicinity owned by other parties that would require repair.
17. The impact of the proposed project on the values and functions of the total wetland or wetland complex.
The value of the wetland as a habitat for living organisms will be unchanged. The project will be constructed outside the fish spawning season. A function of Meadow Brook is to carry water from a higher elevation to a lower elevation. This project will not interfere with that function.
18. The impact upon the value of the sites included in the latest published edition of the National Register of Natural Landmarks, or sites eligible for such publication.
This project is not located in or near any Natural Landmarks listed on the National Register.

19. The impact upon the value of areas named in acts of congress or presidential proclamations as national rivers, national wilderness areas, national lakeshores, and such areas as may be established under federal, state, or municipal laws for similar and related purposes such as estuarine and marine sanctuaries.
There are no areas named in acts of congress or presidential proclamations as national rivers, national wildness areas, or national lakeshores that will be impacted as a result of this project.
20. The degree to which a project redirects water from one watershed to another.
The project as proposed will not redirect water from one watershed to another.

Additional comments

THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
BUREAU OF BRIDGE MAINTENANCE
7 Hazen Drive, PO Box 483, Concord, NH 03302-0095
Phone: (603) 271-3667 Fax: (603) 271-1588

WETLANDS PERMIT APPLICATION – ATTACHMENT C
Stream Crossing Requirements & Information

Env-Wt 904.09(a) – If the applicant believes that installing the structure specified in the applicable rule is not practicable then the applicant may propose an alternative design in accordance with this section.
1. Please explain why the structure specified in the applicable rule is not practicable (Env-Wt 101.69 defines practicable as *"available and capable of being done after taking into consideration costs, existing technology, and logistics in light of overall project purposes"*) *(question 2, Attachment A, Minor and Major 20 Questions)*;
Meadow Brook has a drainage area of 2.1 square miles which qualifies this stream as a Tier 3 Crossing. The required span based on the NH Stream Crossing Guidelines for a new crossing 24'-0". A structure of this size would cost approximately $750,000. Spending this much money on a structure that could be adequately preserved for approximately $100,000 would not be a practicable use of resources. There would be a significant increase in wetland impacts if a structure of this size were installed due to the additional footprint and for construction.
2. Please explain how the proposed alternative meets the specific design criteria for Tier 2 and Tier 3 crossings to the *maximum extent practicable*. Env-Wt 904.05 Design Criteria for Tier 2 and Tier 3 Stream Crossings – New Tier 2 stream crossings, replacement Tier 2 crossings that do not meet the requirements of Env-Wt 904.07, and new and replacement Tier 3 crossings shall be designed and constructed...
...In accordance with the NH Stream Crossing Guidelines:
The NH Stream Crossing Guidelines do not mention maintenance to a structure in a Tier 3 watershed. **The proposed structure will match the existing slope and alignment.** **The bottom of the existing structure is currently a concrete invert. This condition will not be changed as a result of this project.** **Wildlife passage will be not be changed as a result of this project.** **The proposed structure will maintain the flow depths found in the existing structure.** **The hydraulic capacity of the structure will not be changed.**
...With bed forms and streambed characteristics necessary to cause water depths and velocities within the crossing structure at a variety of flows to be comparable to those found in the natural channel upstream and downstream of the stream crossing:
Water depths and velocities within the crossing at a variety of flows will be comparable to the existing depths and velocities. These flows are comparable to those found in the natural channel upstream and downstream of the stream crossing.
...To provide a vegetated bank on both sides of the watercourse to allow for wildlife passage:
It is not possible to provide vegetated banks on both sides of the watercourse below the roadway, regardless of the type of structure installed. Wildlife passage will not be altered as a result of this project.
...To preserve the natural alignment and gradient of the stream channel, so as to accommodate natural flow regimes and the function of the natural floodplain *(questions 14 and 15, Attachment A, Minor and Major 20 Questions)*;
Accommodation of natural flow regimes will not be changed as a result of this project.

...To accommodate the 100-year frequency flood and to ensure that there is no increase in flood stages on abutting properties *(questions 11 and 14, Attachment A, Minor and Major 20 Questions)*:
Accommodation of the 100-year frequency flood will not be changed as a result of this project.
...To simulate a natural stream channel:
The project as proposed will not alter the existing stream channel.
...So as not to alter sediment transport competence *(question 14, Attachment A, Minor and Major 20 Questions)*:
Nothing that will be a barrier to sediment transport will be installed during this project.
Env-Wt 904.09(c)(3) – The alternative design must meet the general design criteria specified in Env-Wt 904.01:
(a) Not be a barrier to sediment transport *(question 14, Attachment A, Minor and Major 20 Questions)*;
Nothing that will be a barrier to sediment transport will be installed during this project.
(b) Prevent the restriction of high flows and maintain existing low flows *(question 14, Attachment A, Minor and Major 20 Questions)*;
High flows will not be restricted, and low flows will be maintained as a result of this project.
(c) Not obstruct or otherwise substantially disrupt the movement of aquatic life indigenous to the water body beyond the actual duration of construction *(question 7, Attachment A, Minor and Major 20 Questions)*;
Movement of aquatic life will not be altered as a result of this project beyond the actual duration of construction.
(d) Not cause an increase in the frequency of flooding or overtopping of banks *(question 14, Attachment A, Minor and Major 20 Questions)*;
This project will not increase the frequency of flooding. High flows will not be restricted, and low flows will be maintained as a result of this project.
(e) Preserve watercourse connectivity where it currently exists *(question 15, Attachment A, Minor and Major 20 Questions)*;
Connectivity will remain unchanged with the proposed structure and will not be worsened.
(f) Restore watercourse connectivity where...
...connectivity previously was disrupted as a result of human activity(ies) *(question 15, Attachment A, Minor and Major 20 Questions)*;
Connectivity will remain unchanged with the proposed structure and will not be worsened.
...restoration of connectivity will benefit aquatic life upstream or downstream of the crossing *(question 15, Attachment A, Minor and Major 20 Questions)*;
Aquatic life upstream and downstream will not be affected as a result of this project.
(g) Not cause erosion, aggradation, or scouring upstream or downstream of the crossing *(question 14, Attachment A, Minor and Major 20 Questions)*;
Aggradation: This project will not affect aggradation at the project location. **Erosion: The riprap placed on the banks will prevent erosion and preserve the natural alignment and gradient of the stream channel.** **Sedimentation: Nothing that will be a barrier to sediment transport will be installed in this project.**

(h) Not cause water quality degradation *(question 13, Attachment A, Minor and Major 20 Questions)*.
The project as proposed will not impact the quantity or quality of surface and/or groundwater at this site. Best Management Practices will be used to prevent any adverse effect to water quality during construction.

US Army Corps of Engineers ®
New England District

New Hampshire Programmatic General Permit (PGP)
Appendix B - Corps Secondary Impacts Checklist
(for inland wetland/waterway fill projects in New Hampshire)

1. Attach any explanations to this checklist. Lack of information could delay a Corps permit determination.
2. All references to "work" include all work associated with the project construction and operation. Work includes filling, clearing, flooding, draining, excavation, dozing, stumping, etc.
3. See PGP, GC 5, regarding single and complete projects.
4. Contact the Corps at (978) 318-8832 with any questions.

1. Impaired Waters	Yes	No
1.1 Will any work occur within 1 mile upstream in the watershed of an impaired water? See http://des.nh.gov/organization/divisions/water/wmb/section401/impaired_waters.htm to determine if there is an impaired water in the vicinity of your work area.*		X
2. Wetlands	Yes	No
2.1 Are there are streams, brooks, rivers, ponds, or lakes within 200 feet of any proposed work?	X	
2.2 Are there proposed impacts to SAS, shellfish beds, special wetlands and vernal pools (see PGP, GC 26 and Appendix A)? Applicants may obtain information from the NH Department of Resources and Economic Development Natural Heritage Bureau (NHB) website, www.nhnaturalheritage.org, specifically the book Natural Community Systems of New Hampshire.		X
2.3 If wetland crossings are proposed, are they adequately designed to maintain hydrology, sediment transport & wildlife passage?	X	
2.4 Would the project remove part or all of a riparian buffer? (Riparian buffers are lands adjacent to streams where vegetation is strongly influenced by the presence of water. They are often thin lines of vegetation containing native grasses, flowers, shrubs and/or trees that line the stream banks. They are also called vegetated buffer zones.)		X
2.5 The overall project site is more than 40 acres.		X
2.6 What is the size of the existing impervious surface area?	1791 ft²	
2.7 What is the size of the proposed impervious surface area?	1791 ft²	
2.8 What is the % of the impervious area (new and existing) to the overall project site?	0%	
3. Wildlife	Yes	No
3.1 Has the NHB determined that there are known occurrences of rare species, exemplary natural communities, Federal and State threatened and endangered species and habitat, in the vicinity of the proposed project? (All projects require a NHB determination.)		X
3.2 Would work occur in any area identified as either "Highest Ranked Habitat in N.H." or "Highest Ranked Habitat in Ecological Region"? (These areas are colored magenta and green, respectively, on NH Fish and Game's map, "2010 Highest Ranked Wildlife Habitat by Ecological Condition.") Map information can be found at: • PDF: www.wildlife.state.nh.us/Wildlife/Wildlife_Plan/highest_ranking_habitat.htm. • Data Mapper: www.granit.unh.edu. • GIS: www.granit.unh.edu/data/downloadfreedata/category/databycategory.html.	X	

3.3 Would the project impact more than 20 acres of an undeveloped land block (upland, wetland/waterway) on the entire project site and/or on an adjoining property(s)?		X
3.4 Does the project propose more than a 10-lot residential subdivision, or a commercial or industrial development?		X
3.5 Are stream crossings designed in accordance with the PGP, GC 21?	X	
4. Flooding/Floodplain Values	Yes	No
4.1 Is the proposed project within the 100-year floodplain of an adjacent river or stream?		X
4.2 If 4.1 is yes, will compensatory flood storage be provided if the project results in a loss of flood storage?		N/A
5. Historic/Archaeological Resources		
For a minor or major impact project - a copy of the Request for Project Review (RPR) Form (www.nh.gov/nhdhr/review) shall be sent to the NH Division of Historical Resources as required on Page 5 of the PGP**		N/A

*Although this checklist utilizes state information, its submittal to the Corps is a Federal requirement.

** If project is not within Federal jurisdiction, coordination with NH DHR is not required under Federal law..

PART Env-Wt 404 CRITERIA FOR SHORELINE STABILIZATION

The rehabilitation of the bridge that carries Rte. 11B over Meadow Brook proposes the placement of stone fill within areas under the jurisdiction of the NH Wetlands Bureau and the US Army Corps of Engineers. The stone fill will be located in the channel and along the bank of the proposed structure as shown on the plans.

Pursuant to PART Wt 404 Criteria for Shoreline Stabilization, the following addresses each codified section of the Administrative Rules:

Wt 404.01 Least Intrusive Method

The riverbank stabilization treatment proposed is the least intrusive construction method necessary to minimize the disruption to the existing shorelines. The stone treatment can be reasonably constructed utilizing general highway construction methods.

Wt 404.02 Diversion of Water

Proposed roadway drainage will allow storm water run-off to be diverted so that it will flow over vegetated areas, insofar as possible, prior to entering Meadow Brook. This will minimize erosion of the shoreline.

Wt 404.03 Vegetative Stabilization

Natural vegetation will be left undisturbed to the maximum extent possible. The only locations being disturbed are the impacted areas on the plan for construction. All newly developed slopes and disturbed areas will have humus and seed applied for turf establishment, which will help stabilize the project area.

Wt 404.04 Rip-Rap

(a) Stone fill, as proposed, is shown on the attached plans to protect the channel and bank as necessary. Stable embankments are necessary to maintain the structural integrity of the bridge during all flow conditions.

(b) (1-5) The minimum and maximum stone size, the gradation, cross sections of the stone fill, proposed location, and other details have been provided on the attached plans. Bedding for the stone fill will consist of natural ground excavated to the proposed underside of the stone fill.

(b) (6) Enclosed are plan sheets to sufficiently indicate the relationship of the project to fixed points of reference, abutting properties, and features of the natural shoreline.

(b) (7) Stone fill is recommended for the limits shown on the attached plans to protect the banks from erosion during flood flows, from scour during all flows, and slopes greater than 2:1 have difficulty supporting vegetation.

(c) This project is not located adjacent to a great pond or water body where the state holds fee simple ownership.

(d) Stone fill is proposed to extend down to and adequately keyed into the channel bottom to prevent possible undermining of the slope.

(e) The enclosed plan has been stamped by a professional engineer.

Hydraulic Data

Drainage Area – 2.10 sq mi

Q 100 = 270 cfs



Figure 8: Watershed (Combine both due to NH Streamstats error).

New Hampshire Natural Heritage Bureau

To: Tony Weatherbee
7 Hazen Drive
Concord, NH 03302

Date: 11/6/2015

From: NH Natural Heritage Bureau

Re: Review by NH Natural Heritage Bureau of request dated 11/6/2015

NHB File ID: NHB15-3556 Applicant: Tony Weatherbee

Location: Tax Map(s)/Lot(s):
Gilford

Project Description: Existing structure is a concrete frame bridge. Proposed work consists of the following: place sandbag cofferdams, place temporary scaffolding, replace concrete deck, patch substructure and place riprap.

The NH Natural Heritage database has been checked for records of rare species and exemplary natural communities near the area mapped below. The species considered include those listed as Threatened or Endangered by either the state of New Hampshire or the federal government. We currently have no recorded occurrences for sensitive species near this project area.

A negative result (no record in our database) does not mean that a sensitive species is not present. Our data can only tell you of known occurrences, based on information gathered by qualified biologists and reported to our office. However, many areas have never been surveyed, or have only been surveyed for certain species. An on-site survey would provide better information on what species and communities are indeed present.

This report is valid through 11/5/2016.

Department of Resources and Economic Development
Division of Forests and Lands
(603) 271-2214 fax: 271-6488

DRED/NHB
172 Pembroke Road
Concord NH 03301

MAP OF PROJECT BOUNDARIES FOR NHB FILE ID: NHB15-3556



Department of Resources and Economic Development
Division of Forests and Lands
(603) 271-2214 fax: 271-6488

DRED/NHB
172 Pembroke Road
Concord NH 03301

MITIGATION REPORT

This project is maintenance of an existing structure and therefore mitigation is not required. At the November 18, 2015 Natural Resources Agency Meeting it was determined that no mitigation would be required.

Project Gilford 40776

Wetland Application – NHDOT Cultural Resources Review

For the purpose of compliance with regulations of the National Historic Preservation Act, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation's *Procedures for the Protection of Historic Properties* (36 CFR 800), the US Army Corps of Engineers' *Appendix C*, and/or state regulation RSA 227-C:9, *Directive for Cooperation in the Protection of Historic Resources*, the NHDOT Cultural Resources Program has reviewed the enclosed Standard Dredge and Fill Application for potential impacts to historic properties.

Above Ground Review

Known/approximate age of structure: 097/094 Concrete Box - 1930 1930

☒ No Potential to Cause Effect/No Concerns

☐ Concerns:

Below Ground Review

Recorded Archaeological site: ☐Yes ☑No

Nearest Recorded Archaeological Site Name & Number:

☐Pre-Contact ☑Post-Contact 27-BK-0129 Lady of the Lake Site

Distance from Project Area:

1.66 miles (1.876 Km) NE of project area

☑ No Potential to Cause Effect/No Concerns due to minimal subsurface impacts for replacement of concrete deck, riprap installation

☐ Concerns:

Reviewed by:

Sheila Charles

NHDOT Cultural Resources Staff

12-3-2015

12/3/2015

Date:

Figure 1: South approach (6/2000).

Figure 2: Upstream elevation (10/2015).

Figure 3: Delamination, leaking and rust stains in deck centerline (7/2001).

Figure 4: Upstream (10/2015).

Figure 5: Bridge located downstream (10/2015).

Figure 6: Downstream elevation (9/2015).

Figure 7: Riprap on right wingwall to be repaired (9/2015).